UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/802,778	03/18/2004	Seiji Harada	1011350-000327	4682

21839 7590 12/22/2010

BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC
POST OFFICE BOX 1404
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER	
MCLEAN, NEIL R	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/22/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com
offserv@bipc.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/802,778	HARADA, SEIJI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Neil R. McLean	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 October 2010*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. Claims 1-19 are now pending in this application.

Claim 1 is currently amended.

Response to Arguments

2. Regarding Applicant's Argument (page 9, lines 12-23):

"As acknowledged by the Office Action, *Takayama* does not disclose the combination of claim 1 that includes "if the user's instruction is to change the processing condition in step 4), providing the user with the setup screen to accept through the setup screen an input to change the processing condition for the job from the user". The Office Action alleges that this step is taught by *Kuroda,* specifically citing step $1504, column 22, lines 27 - 32, and Figures 19 - 20. However, there is no disclosure in *Kuroda* of this step, and in particular if the user's instruction is to change the processing condition. *Kuroda* states that "The printer is changed by an arbitrary timing input made through the setting windows shown in Figures 18A and 18B. See column 22, lines 34 - 36. However, there is no discussion of changing the printing conditions through a user instruction. And, there is no teaching or suggestion of a "setup screen to accept through the setup screen an input of a processing condition for a job from the user", and wherein "if the user's instruction is to change the processing

condition in step 4), providing the user with *the* setup screen to accept through the setup screen an input to change the processing condition for the job from the user."

Examiner's Response:

Takayama discloses substantially the invention of claim 1, however

Takayama does not disclose expressly providing a user with a setup screen to accept through the setup screen an input of a processing condition for a job from the user, the setup screen being provided by a computer program for transmitting the job to a job processing device; and

If the user's instruction is to change the processing condition, providing the user with the setup screen to accept through the setup screen an input to change the processing condition for the job from the user.

Kuroda discloses providing a user with a setup screen to accept through the setup screen an input of a processing condition for a job from the user (Figure 15 Flowchart; 'DISPLAY OUTPUT STATE ON THE BASIS OF OBTAINED INFORMATION'), the setup screen being provided by a computer program for transmitting the job to a job processing device; and

If the user's instruction is to change the processing condition, providing the user with the setup screen to accept through the setup screen an input to change the processing condition for the job from the user (Thus, by processing in step S1504, the output conditions according to the group printer settings can be reflected in the editing window of the editing application (bookbinding application 104), thereby enabling the user to visually understandably recognize the output conditions of a plurality of printers while editing the general-purpose printing file; Column 22, lines 27-32; Also see Figures 19 and 20 where the printing conditions inputted by the user/operator effect changes in the setup screen).

Kuroda & Takayama are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor of image processing; e.g., both references discloses methods of print control processing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to providing a user with a setup screen to accept through the setup screen an input of a processing condition for a job from the user, the setup screen being provided by a computer program for transmitting the job to a job processing device; and If the user's instruction is to change the processing condition, providing the user with the setup screen to accept through the setup screen an input to change the processing condition for the job from the user. The suggestion/motivation for doing so is to enable the user to more easily determine the output destination(s) without performing a troublesome operation as disclosed by Kuroda in the Background of Invention. Kuroda further discloses the need for improving the editing system with respect to the distributed printing system and that substantial room for improvement between the linking of the two systems. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kuroda's setup screen with Takayama's information processing system to obtain the invention as specified to increase the processing speed of a printing system by enabling the user to visually understandably recognize the output conditions of a plurality of printers.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takayama et al. (US 6,477,570) hereinafter 'Takayama' in view of Kuroda et al. (US 7,609,400) hereinafter 'Kuroda'.

Regarding Claim 1: (Currently Amended)

Takayama discloses a computer readable medium storing a computer program for causing a computer in a job transmitting device to execute a process comprising the steps of:

1) accepting an input of a processing condition for a job from a user (FIG. 4: STEP S110 'INPUT OF JOB');

2) acquiring status information by the job transmitting device , wherein the status information concerning the status of a job processing device that processes said job (STEP S118; a check is performed to determine whether or not the job can be executed) and is communicatively connected to the computer;

3) judging by the job transmitting device whether said job can be processed by the job processing device according to said processing condition or not based on said inputted processing condition and said status information before transmitting said job to the job processing device (STEP S157 'IS IT OPTIMUM TO EXECTUE JOB ON ONE'S OWN?'; STEP S160 'ANY APPARATUS ADAPTED TO JOB OBJECT?'); and

4) providing a user with a notification by the job transmitting device (FIG. 17 is a diagram showing an example display for a window proposed to a user) before transmitting said job to the job processing device if it is judged that said job cannot be processed in step 3); wherein

in step 4), if it is judged that said job cannot be processed in step 3) (IF STEP S160 'ANY APPARATUS ADAPTED TO JOB OBJECT' is 'NO'), accepting at least one of a user's instruction to change the processing condition and a user's instruction to compulsorily execute the job according to the processing condition before transmitting said job to the job processing device (STEP S165 'PROPOSE PLAN TO ENHANCE JOB OBJECT') (Note: this bypasses STEP 160 'Execute Job', that is to say it is before the job is transmitted).

Takayama discloses substantially the invention of claim 1, however

Takayama does not disclose expressly providing a user with a setup screen to accept through the setup screen an input of a processing condition for a job from the user, the setup screen being provided by a computer program for transmitting the job to a job processing device; and

If the user's instruction is to change the processing condition, providing the user with the setup screen to accept through the setup screen an input to change the processing condition for the job from the user.

Kuroda discloses providing a user with a setup screen to accept through the setup screen an input of a processing condition for a job from the user (Figure 15 Flowchart; 'DISPLAY OUTPUT STATE ON THE BASIS OF OBTAINED INFORMATION'), the setup screen being provided by a computer program for transmitting the job to a job processing device; and

If the user's instruction is to change the processing condition, providing the user with the setup screen to accept through the setup screen an input to change the processing condition for the job from the user (Thus, by processing in step S1504, the output conditions according to the group printer settings can be reflected in the editing window of the editing application (bookbinding application 104), thereby enabling the user to visually understandably recognize the output conditions of a plurality of printers while editing the general-purpose printing file; Column 22, lines 27-32; Also see Figures 19 and 20 where the printing conditions inputted by the user/operator effect changes in the setup screen).

Kuroda & Takayama are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor of image processing; e.g., both references discloses methods of print control processing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to providing a user with a setup screen to accept through the setup screen an input of a processing condition for a job from the user, the setup screen being provided by a computer program for transmitting the job to a job processing device; and If the user's instruction is to change the processing condition, providing the user with the setup screen to accept through the setup screen an input to change the processing condition for the job from the user. The suggestion/motivation for doing so is to enable the user to more easily determine the output destination(s) without performing a troublesome operation as disclosed by Kuroda in the Background of Invention. Kuroda further discloses the need for improving the editing system with respect to the distributed printing system and that substantial room for improvement between the linking of the two systems. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kuroda's setup screen with Takayama's information processing system to obtain the invention as specified to increase the processing speed of a printing system

by enabling the user to visually understandably recognize the output conditions of a plurality of printers.

Regarding Claim 2: (Original)

A program as claimed in claim 1, wherein said job processing device is a printing device (e.g., Color Printer BjC600 and Black and White Printer LBP9000 in Figure 40), and said status condition includes at least one of the presence or absence of paper loaded in the printing device (e.g., Figure 40, Status Table showing remaining paper quantity), the size of the paper, and the kind of the paper.

Regarding Claim 3: (Original)

A program as claimed in claim 1, wherein in step 4), the content of a judgment is displayed on a display unit (e.g., PC 101 in Figure 1).

Regarding Claim 4: (Original)

A program as claimed in claim 1, wherein change of the designated processing condition can be accepted if it is judged that said job cannot be processed in step 3 (e.g., If there is no apparatus having capabilities consonant with the object of the job, program control moves from step S160 to step S164, whereat a plan is prepared for the use of an optimal method that does not depart from the object of the job, and at step S165 the plan is proposed to a user as described in Column 14, lines 11-15).

Regarding Claim 5: (Original)

A program as claimed in claim 1, wherein said status information is acquired from the job processing device for each job in step 2) (At step S155 the **status** of the apparatus is examined. At step S156 the status of another apparatus consonant with the object of the job is examined.)

Regarding Claim 6: (Original)

A program as claimed in claim 1, wherein status information received from the job processing device and stored in a storage unit in advance is acquired in step 2) (e.g. Print Job Memory Unit 513 in Figure 51).

Regarding Claim 7: (Original)

A computer readable recording medium on which the program as claimed in claim 1 is recorded (The program code or device which performs the function described in Embodiment Nine).

Regarding Claim 8: (Previously Presented)

A job monitoring method comprising the steps of:

1) setting processing condition of a job (FIG. 15 is a flowchart showing the processing for a ninth embodiment. At step S150 a check is performed to determine whether or not a job has been input.);

2) acquiring status information, which is information concerning the status of a job processing device that processes said job (At step S155 the status of the apparatus is examined. At step S156 the status of another apparatus consonant with the object of the job is examined.);

3) judging whether said job can be processed by the job processing device according to said processing condition or not based on said processing condition and said status information before transmitting said job to the job processing device (e.g., When, as the result of a comparison of the statues of the locally owned apparatus and other apparatuses, it is found that the locally owned apparatus is optimal for the performance of the job, program control moves from step S157 to step S158, whereat it is determined that the owned apparatus will perform the job, and at step S159 the job is performed by the locally owned apparatus as described in Column 13, line 62 – Column 14, line 1); and

4) notifying content of a judgment if it is judged that said job cannot be processed in step 3) (If there is no apparatus having capabilities consonant with the object of the job, program control moves from step S160 to step S164, whereat a plan is prepared for the use of an optimal method that does not depart from the object of the job, and at step S165 the plan is proposed to a user as described in Column 14, lines 11-15); wherein

in step 4), if it is judged that said job cannot be processed in step 3) (IF STEP S160 'ANY APPARATUS ADAPTED TO JOB OBJECT' is 'NO'), accepting at least one of a user's instruction (STEP S165 'PROPOSE PLAN TO ENHANCE JOB OBJECT') to change the processing condition and a user's instruction to compulsorily execute the job according to the processing condition before transmitting said job to the job processing device (FIG. 17 is a diagram showing an example display for a window by which an optimal method is proposed to a user).

Takayama discloses substantially the invention of claim 8, however

Takayama does not disclose expressly providing a user with a setup screen to accept through the setup screen an input of a processing condition for a job from the user, the setup screen being provided by a computer program for transmitting the job to a job processing device; and

If the user's instruction is to change the processing condition, providing the user with the setup screen to accept through the setup screen an input to change the processing condition for the job from the user.

Kuroda discloses providing a user with a setup screen to accept through the setup screen an input of a processing condition for a job from the user (Figure 15 Flowchart; 'DISPLAY OUTPUT STATE ON THE BASIS OF OBTAINED INFORMATION'), the setup screen being provided by a computer program for transmitting the job to a job processing device; and

If the user's instruction is to change the processing condition, providing the user with the setup screen to accept through the setup screen an input to change the processing condition for the job from the user (Thus, by processing in step S1504, the output conditions according to the group printer settings can be reflected in the editing window of the editing application (bookbinding application 104), thereby enabling the user to visually understandably recognize the output conditions of a plurality of printers while editing the general-purpose printing file; Column 22, lines 27-32; Also see Figures 19 and 20 where the printing conditions inputted by the user/operator effect changes in the setup screen).

Kuroda & Takayama are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor of image processing; e.g., both references discloses methods of print control processing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to providing a user with a setup screen to accept through the setup screen an input of a processing condition for a job from the user, the setup screen

being provided by a computer program for transmitting the job to a job processing device; and If the user's instruction is to change the processing condition, providing the user with the setup screen to accept through the setup screen an input to change the processing condition for the job from the user. The suggestion/motivation for doing so is to enable the user to more easily determine the output destination(s) without performing a troublesome operation as disclosed by Kuroda in the Background of Invention. Kuroda further discloses the need for improving the editing system with respect to the distributed printing system and that substantial room for improvement between the linking of the two systems. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kuroda's setup screen with Takayama's information processing system to obtain the invention as specified to increase the processing speed of a printing system by enabling the user to visually understandably recognize the output conditions of a plurality of printers.

Regarding Claim 9: (Original)

A job monitoring method as claimed in claim 8, wherein said job processing device is a printing device (e.g., Color Printer BjC600 and Black and White Printer LBP9000 in Figure 40), and said status condition includes at least one of the presence or absence of paper loaded in the printing device (e.g., Figure 40, Status Table showing remaining paper quantity), the size of the paper, and the kind of the paper.

Regarding Claim 10: (Original)

A job monitoring method as claimed in claim 8, wherein in step 4), the content of a judgment (Column 14, lines 26-29) in step 3) is displayed on a display unit (e.g., PC 101 in Figure 1).

Regarding Claim 11: (Original)

A job monitoring method as claimed in claim 8, wherein change of the designated processing condition can be accepted if it is judged that said job cannot be processed in step 3) (e.g., If there is no apparatus having capabilities consonant with the object of the job, program control moves from step S160 to step S164, whereat a plan is prepared for the use of an optimal method that does not depart from the object of the job, and at step S165 the plan is proposed to a user as described in Column 14, lines 11-15).

Regarding Claim 12: (Original)

A job monitoring method as claimed in claim 8, wherein said status information is acquired from the job processing device for each job in step 2) (At step S155 the **status** of the apparatus is examined. At step S156 the status of another apparatus consonant with the object of the job is examined.)

Regarding Claim 13: (Original)

A job monitoring method as claimed in claim 8, wherein status information received from the job processing device and stored in a storage unit in advance is acquired in step 2) (e.g. Print Job Memory Unit 513 in Figure 51).

Regarding Claims 14-19:

The rejection of Program and Method claims 1-13, renders obvious the steps of the device of claims 14-19 because these steps occur in the operation of the Program and Method as discussed above. Thus, the arguments similar to that presented above for claims 1-13 are equally applicable to claims 14-19.

Conclusion

Examiner Notes

5. The Examiner cites particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that, in preparing responses, the applicant fully considers the references in its entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or as disclosed by the Examiner.

6. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Neil R. McLean whose telephone number is (571)270-1679. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30AM-4:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on 571.272.7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Neil R. McLean/
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/David K Moore/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625